

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 ANGELA SCHNEIDER,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 WELLS FARGO, STEAMBOAT  
PARTNERS, LLC,

14 Defendants.  
15

Civil No. 13cv0565 JAH(DHB)

ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANT'S UNOPPOSED  
MOTION TO DISMISS [DOC. # 7]  
AND VACATING HEARING DATE

16 **INTRODUCTION**

17 Pending before the Court is the motion to dismiss filed by defendant Wells Fargo  
18 Bank, N.A. (erroneously sued as Wells Fargo) ("defendant") for failure to state a claim  
19 against defendant upon which relief may be granted pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the  
20 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff did not file an opposition to the motion. After  
21 a careful review of defendant's motion, this Court **GRANTS** defendant's unopposed  
22 motion to dismiss and vacates the date set for hearing the motion.

23 **BACKGROUND**

24 Plaintiff, appearing *pro se*, filed the instant complaint on March 11, 2013, seeking  
25 damages based on defendant's alleged violations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15  
26 U.S.C. § 1681, *et seq.*, the Federal Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.*  
27 and California's Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1788-  
28 1788.33. *See* Doc. # 1 at 1. Defendant filed the instant motion to dismiss plaintiff's

1 complaint on May 2, 2013. Doc. # 7. As of the date of this order, no opposition or other  
2 response has been filed by plaintiff.

### 3 DISCUSSION

4 Defendant's unopposed motion to dismiss seeks dismissal of the action for failure  
5 to state a claim. The Ninth Circuit has held that a district court may properly grant a  
6 motion to dismiss as unopposed pursuant to a local rule where the local rule permits, but  
7 does not require the granting of a motion for failure to respond. *See, generally, Ghazali v.*  
8 *Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (*per curiam*) (affirming dismissal for failure to  
9 timely file opposition papers). Civil Local Rule 7.1(f.3.c) expressly provides that "[i]f an  
10 opposing party fails to file the papers in the manner required by Local Rule 7.1(e.2), that  
11 failure may constitute a consent to the granting of that motion or other request for ruling  
12 by the court."

13 Prior to granting an unopposed motion for dismissal, the Court must weigh the  
14 following factors: "(1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the  
15 court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the  
16 public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less  
17 drastic sanctions." *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53 (quoting *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d  
18 1421, 1423 (9th Cir. 1986)). The Ninth Circuit has recognized that the first and fourth  
19 factors cut in opposite directions. *See Yourish v. California Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 990  
20 (9th Cir. 1999) (first factor always weighs in favor of dismissal); *Hernandez v. City of El*  
21 *Monte*, 138 F.3d 393, 401 (9th Cir. 1998) (fourth factor counsels against dismissal).

22 After a review of the record, this Court finds that the second factor weighs in favor  
23 of dismissal. As the court noted in *Yourish*, the routine noncompliance of litigants should  
24 not prevent the court from managing its docket. *Yourish*, 191 F. 3d 990. Plaintiff failed  
25 to comply with one of the most basic requirements of litigation and, to date, offers no  
26 excuse for failing to respond to defendants' motion to dismiss. The fact that plaintiff has  
27 yet to make any attempt to address the motion to dismiss also supports a finding of  
28 prejudice towards defendant and weighs in favor of dismissal. Finally, with respect to

1 whether less drastic measures have been considered, in the interest of lessening the  
2 sanction imposed on plaintiff, the Court will grant defendant's motion to dismiss without  
3 prejudice. Thus, this Court finds the factors weigh heavily in favor of granting defendant's  
4 motion to dismiss.

5 **CONCLUSION AND ORDER**

6 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 7 1. Defendant's motion to dismiss [doc. # 7] is **GRANTED**;
- 8 2. The claims against defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. contained in the  
9 instant complaint are **DISMISSED without prejudice**; and
- 10 3. The date of June 17, 2013 set for hearing defendant's motion is **VACATED**.

11 Dated: June 10, 2013

12 

13 JOHN A. HOUSTON  
14 United States District Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28